REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2006. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-18, 21-30, and 32 are now present in this case. Claims 8, 11, and 19 are canceled. Claims 1, 7, 9, 14, 17, 25, and 32 are amended.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19, 21-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,700,888 to Jonsson et al. combined with U.S. Patent No. 6,680,921 to Svanbro et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Jonsson et al. attempts to solve the same problem as does the present disclosure, namely reducing the size of the header for transmission over band limited links, such as a radio link. (See Jonsson et al., column 1, lines 39-41.) Jonsson et al. recognizes that header compression is commonly used for such reduction. However, Jonsson et al. is directed to a technique for purposefully violating the integrity of header fields in order to reduce the size of the header field. (See column 2, lines 32-39.) The Office Action recognizes that Jonsson et al. does not show a header compressor configured to compress only relevant portions of the extracted header. (See Office Action, page 3.) However, the Office Action does not appreciate that Jonsson et al. teaches directly away from the claimed invention by solving the same problem in an entirely different manner. That is, Jonsson et al. violates the integrity of the data headers in order to reduce the overall size of the headers being transmitted. This does not teach or suggest any elimination of any part of the header, but a radical processing technique for violating the integrity of headers.

The Office Action asserts that Svanbro et al. overcomes the deficiencies of Jonsson et al. This is incorrect. The Office Action, at page 3, cites Figure 3 of Svanbro et al. as disclosing a header compressor "configured to compress only relevant portions [i.e. time stamp compression] of the extracted header." In the same sentence, the Office Action appears to state that the relevant portions comprise other fields as well. This mischaracterizes Svanbro et al. Svanbro et al. is directed to a technique for estimating time stamps in real time packet communications. The time stamp

information is separated from the header and is processed in a special manner described within Svanbro et al. The other header information (i.e., non-time stamp information) is compressed using conventional header compression techniques and recombined with the time stamp field. (See Svanbro et al., column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 4.) The compressed header 22 in Figure 3 of Svanbro et al. comprises the time stamp field and all other fields. Thus, Svanbro et al. processes the time stamp information separately, but does not teach or suggest any technique by which less than the entire header is transferred to a remote unit.

In sharp contrast to the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al., claim 1 is directed to a call context processor operable in a wireless communication system having a base and a remote unit wherein the call context processor is operable in the base unit to process a data packet having a payload and a header "wherein the base transfers the associated payload and payload type header portion, less than the entire header, to the remote unit." The combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest transferring less than the entire header to a remote unit. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 1, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 7 is directed to a transmission network and recites components in which a base "transfers the payload to a remote unit and does not transfer the entire header to the remote unit." As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest transferring anything less than the entire header to the remote unit. Accordingly, claim 7 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. Claims 8-10, and 13-16 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 7, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 17 is directed to a machine readable medium storing a plurality of instructions and recites *inter alia* instructions to "transfer the payload and only the compressed relevant portions of the header, less than the entire header, to a remote unit." As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not

teach or suggest transferring only compressed relevant portions of the header, less than the entire header, to a remote unit. Accordingly, claim 17 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. Claim 18 and 21-24 are also allowable over in view of the fact that they depend from claim 17, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 25 is a method claim for processing a data packet having a payload and a header and recites *inter alia* "transmitting only the relevant portions of the extracted header, less than the entire header, and the payload to a remote unit." As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest transmitting only relevant portions of the extracted header, less than the entire header, to a remote unit. Accordingly, claim 25 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. Claims 26-30 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 25, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claim 32 is directed to a call context processor for processing a data packet having a payload and a header. A header compressor is configured to compress "only relevant portions of the extracted header, the relevant portions comprising a source internet protocol (IP) address, a destination IP address, a source port, a destination port, a sequence number, and a time stamp." Claim 32 further recites that the call context processor "transfers the payload and only the relevant portions of the header, less than the complete header, to a remote unit." As discussed above, the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al. do not teach or suggest sending only the relevant portions of the header, less than the complete header, to the remote unit as recited in claim 32. Accordingly, claim 32 is clearly allowable over the combination of Jonsson et al. and Svanbro et al.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a

good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Alok K. Saxena et al.

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/Michael J. Donohue, Reg. #35859/
Michael J. Donohue

MJD:gatc

600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1899009_1.DOC